

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress
2nd Session

Vote No. 105

April 28, 1998, 2:29 pm
Page S-3686 Temp. Record

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM/Conference, Passage

SUBJECT: Conference report to accompany the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1997 . . . H.R. 1757. Agreeing to the report.

ACTION: CONFERENCE REPORT AGREED TO, 51-49

SYNOPSIS: The conference report to accompany H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1997, will reorganize and consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States Government. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), the United States Information Agency (USIA), and the United States International Development Cooperation Agency (IDCA) will be abolished and their functions will be incorporated into the State Department. The Agency for International Development (AID) will be placed under the direct oversight of the State Department and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) will be placed under AID. Arrearages of \$819 million to the United Nations will be paid over 3 years subject to certain conditions. The bill will authorize \$6.104 billion in fiscal year (FY) 1998 and \$6.664 billion in FY 1999 for the State Department and other foreign affairs agencies, including the Peace Corps. Key details are listed below.

Consolidation:

- the ACDA will be abolished by October 1998 and its functions will be transferred to the State Department and put under the control of the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security (that post will be created by this bill);
- the USIA will be abolished by October 1, 1999 and its functions will be transferred to the State Department and put under the control of the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy (that post will be created by this bill);
- the broadcasting services will remain independent from the State Department (see 105th Congress, first session, vote No. 104 for related debate);
- the IDCA will be eliminated by October 1, 1998, thereby severing the AID Administrator's direct link to the President and placing him under the direction of the Secretary of State;
- the statutory requirement to allocate development and economic assistance directly to AID will be eliminated; all U.S. foreign

(See other side)

| YEAS (51) | | | NAYS (49) | | | NOT VOTING (0) | |
|----------------------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Republicans (49 or 89%) | | Democrats (2 or 4%) | Republicans (6 or 11%) | Democrats (43 or 96%) | | Republicans (0) | Democrats (0) |
| Abraham | Helms | Breaux | Chafee | Akaka | Kennedy | | |
| Allard | Hutchinson | Ford | Collins | Baucus | Kerrey | | |
| Ashcroft | Hutchison | | Jeffords | Biden | Kerry | | |
| Bennett | Inhofe | | Roth | Bingaman | Kohl | | |
| Bond | Kempthorne | | Snowe | Boxer | Landrieu | | |
| Brownback | Kyl | | Specter | Bryan | Lautenberg | | |
| Burns | Lott | | | Bumpers | Leahy | | |
| Campbell | Lugar | | | Byrd | Levin | | |
| Coats | Mack | | | Cleland | Lieberman | | |
| Cochran | McCain | | | Conrad | Mikulski | | |
| Coverdell | McConnell | | | Daschle | Moseley-Braun | | |
| Craig | Murkowski | | | Dodd | Moynihan | | |
| D'Amato | Nickles | | | Dorgan | Murray | | |
| DeWine | Roberts | | | Durbin | Reed | | |
| Domenici | Santorum | | | Feingold | Reid | | |
| Enzi | Sessions | | | Feinstein | Robb | | |
| Faircloth | Shelby | | | Glenn | Rockefeller | | |
| Frist | Smith, Bob | | | Graham | Sarbanes | | |
| Gorton | Smith, Gordon | | | Harkin | Torricelli | | |
| Gramm | Stevens | | | Hollings | Wellstone | | |
| Grams | Thomas | | | Inouye | Wyden | | |
| Grassley | Thompson | | | Johnson | | | |
| Gregg | Thurmond | | | | | | |
| Hagel | Warner | | | | | | |
| Hatch | | | | | | | |

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
AN—Announced Nay
PY—Paired Yea
PN—Paired Nay

VOTE NO. 105

APRIL 28, 1998

assistance programs will be funded through the State Department; and

- the State Department will supervise AID programs to ensure that they are consistent with U.S. foreign policy.

Conditions on current payments to the United Nations (for FYs 1998-1999):

- the United Nations must implement a negative growth budget for the 1998-1999 budgetary cycle;
- total funding for U.S. contributions to international organizations will be capped at \$900 million annually;
- the value of U.S. goods and services provided to United Nations peacekeeping efforts will be counted as part of the United States' assessment for those efforts, and the United States must be reimbursed to the extent that its assessment is exceeded;
- personnel reductions promised by the United Nations Secretary General must be implemented, and the United Nations must have a strong and independent Inspector General;
- United States funds will not be used for any global United Nations conferences, and United States assessments for the United Nations will not be used to fund other organizations; and
- the President will notify and consult with Congress on United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Conditions on payments of arrearages (unpaid prior assessments) to the United Nations (see 105th Congress, first session, vote No. 102 for related debate):

- for each of FYs 1998-2000, the State Department will have to certify: that the United Nations accepts the payments in this bill as full payment for past arrearages; that the United Nations and its ao the United Nations (see 105th Con

APRIL 28, 1998

VOTE NO. 105

satisfied by the current requirement in law that prohibits such organizations from using aid to perform abortions, but that requirement ignores the fact that money is fungible. An organization that raises 50 percent of its own funds could say that it used those funds for abortions, but used the 50 percent in funding it got from United States foreign aid to meet its administrative expenses, contraceptive distribution costs, or other costs. The reality, obviously, is that the United States aid makes it possible for such organizations to perform many more abortions. Giving money to an organization for its non-abortion costs just frees up more money to perform abortions. There is no way to honestly say that foreign aid that goes to abortionists is only used for their non-abortion activities.

We are very pleased with the language on restricting lobbying activities on abortion. In many countries and many cultures of the world (though unfortunately not in the wealthy, amoral United States) the sanctity of human life is cherished from conception to natural death. Hundreds of millions of people live in countries in which most people are strongly pro-life. A common perception around the world of America is that it is a bully that attempts to coerce other countries into behaviors and policies of which the United States approves. The phrase that sums up this perception is "ugly American." The United States justly earns that epithet with its population control and particularly its pro-abortion foreign policies. In a country that champions human life, and that sees its children as treasures rather than teeming burdens, how do our colleagues suppose it appears when rich Americans appear, promising them aid and pressuring them to have fewer children and to promote abortion? Let us turn it around for a moment--suppose, in a few years, we trade ourselves into economic subservience to communist China. Would it then be appropriate for China to talk about giving us aid and at the same time lobby Congress to enact a one-child policy? Our colleagues tell us that the ban applies to foreign organizations using their own money, but again that is a distinction without a difference. If the United States gives foreign assistance to an organization that says it is using its "own" money (again, money is fungible) to lobby for abortion, the foreign government involved is obviously going to just view that organization as a proxy for the United States Government. The pressure is just as real and just as immoral.

The Senate-passed version of this bill did not contain any language on this subject, compromise or not. That does not mean that many of us find the language in any way inappropriate. Instead, in the Senate, the dispute was deferred for other legislation. Our House colleagues, though, feel very strongly that the Mexico City policy should at least be partially codified on this bill. They have compromised as far as they feel they are able, and we frankly agree that they should not compromise any further. We remind our colleagues that many pro-life Members in the House, and many of us here in the Senate, are not generally supportive of giving foreign aid, and we are particularly opposed to giving so-called "arrearages" (past due bills) to the United Nations. The United Nations is full of ingrate nations that regularly oppose United States policies, and at the same time the United Nations makes the United States pay a hugely disproportionate share of the bills. In our opinion, we do not have any outstanding debts to the United Nations and we should not give it dime one. President Clinton and liberal Democrats, though, want to give it money.

President Clinton has indicated that he may veto this bill. Apparently he and some Democratic Members believe that Republicans will then remove the compromise language on abortion and pass the bill again. They are wrong. If he vetoes this bill it is dead, and no United Nations arrearages will be approved on any bill. This reform legislation is not a "must pass" item. We would y

This abortion language should not have been added to a bill on reorganizing the State Department. It was added at the insistence of a minority of conservative Members of the House. The House leadership felt it had to add the language to keep the support of those conservatives. The House leadership may have felt it had to take that action, but we in the Senate have no need of catering to House conservatives. President Clinton should veto this conference report, and insist on the passage of the same bill without the abortion language. Some of our colleagues tell us that they and the House will not be willing to consider another bill. They tell us that if this conference report is not enacted the bill is dead, and with it will die the United Nations arrearages. Perhaps we are wrong, but we think they are bluffing. They are trying to blackmail the President into letting this bill become law. Our colleagues will not ignore the United States' obligation to pay United Nations arrearages. Therefore, we are calling their bluff, voting against the conference report, and urging a presidential veto.